

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 7830 of 2014 (O/M)
Date of decision : 20.11.2015

Balihar Singh

..... Revisionist

Versus

Neeru Malik and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate, for the revisionist.
Mr. Parveen Gupta, Advocate, for,
Mr. Sanjeev Trikha, Advocate, for respondents No. 1 to 4.
Mr. Harish Dewedi, Advocate, for respondent No. 5.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Challenged in the present revision is the order dated 15.9.2014 (Annexure-P-5), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Amritsar, vide which the application filed by defendant No. 2 under Order 6 Rule 17 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, for amendment of written statement, was dismissed.

By way of amendment of written statement, defendant No. 2 wanted to mention the details of sale and also wanted to take the plea that he is a bonafide purchaser. The lower Court has

CR No. 7830 of 2014 (O/M)

declined the same on the ground that joint written statement was filed by defendants No. 1 and 2 and now, only defendant No. 2 seeks to amend the written statement, he cannot be allowed to do so.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, I am of the view that if joint written statement is filed, one of the parties can always amend the written statement qua him. The case was at initial stage when the application was filed. Therefore, the impugned order is set aside. The application filed by defendant No. 2 for amendment of the written statement stands allowed. The present revision is accordingly allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

20.11.2015
sjks